DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 455 240 SP 040 169

AUTHOR Cole, Donna J.; Ryan, Charles W.
TITLE Building & Assessing School Partnerships: The Wright State Model.
SPONS AGENCY DeWitt Wallace/Reader's Digest Fund, Pleasantville, NY.
PUB DATE 2001-07-00
NOTE 34p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative (142)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Administrator Attitudes; *College School Cooperation; Elementary Secondary Education; Higher Education; *Internship Programs; *Partnerships in Education; *Portfolio Assessment; Preservice Teacher Education; Student Teachers; Student Teaching; Teacher Attitudes; Teacher Collaboration; Teacher Competencies; Teaching Skills
IDENTIFIERS Wright State University OH

ABSTRACT

This paper describes a process model for evaluating school-university partnerships. It presents one university's inter-collegial collaboration model for teacher content preparation, explains a process for documenting content and teaching proficiency via an electronic portfolio, and presents the evaluation process used in a multifaceted renewal project. Data collection involved observation of participants at advisory group meetings; content analysis of archival material (e.g., minutes and logs); focus group interviews with teachers, school administrators, university faculty, and interns; and surveys of intact groups of teachers, administrators, and interns. Results indicated that there was strong support for the renewal of teacher education and strengthening of partnerships with public schools. Participants considered it an enriching experience for beginning teachers. While there were minor concerns regarding administrative structure and governance, there was significant support for related renewal activities such as the internship program and use of advisory councils with partner schools. Student teachers' PRAXIS-based electronic portfolios demonstrated teaching proficiency and visually displayed their commitment to teaching and making a difference in students' lives. It was concluded that the model developed to assess this renewal effort could be used at other sites seeking to evaluate multi-institution collaboratives. (Contains 16 references.) (SM)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ED 455 240

Building and Assessing School Partnerships

By

Donna J. Cole, Ph.D.
Professor of Education
Director, Office of Professional Field Experiences
Wright State University
371 Allyn Hall
937-775-3253
donna.cole@wright.edu

Charles W. Ryan, Ph.D.
Professor of Education
Director, Graduate Studies
Wright State University
377 Allyn Hall
937-775-3286
charles.ryan@wright.edu

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

D. J. Cole

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

1

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

SP040169

Revised July, 2001

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Building & Assessing School Partnerships: The WRIGHT STATE Model

Introduction

The need for collaborative school-university partnerships during the past decade has led to a number of efforts at the state, regional and national level. As a partner in this renewal agenda Wright State University (WSU), a metropolitan community-focused university, part of the National Network for Educational Renewal (NNER), was selected in 1994 as one of 18 institutions whose process for teacher education reform makes extensive use of PreK-12 sector involvement (Clark, 1997). Also, WSU successfully acquired National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education in the fall of 1996, and developed a process for joint faculty appointments between the College of Education and Human Services (CEHS) and the College of Science and Mathematics (COSM). This *pivotal* factor has made it possible to insure that learned society guidelines are infused into content courses for both elementary and secondary pre-service students.

The professional experiences of teacher education candidates who enter the field from prior professions or training are a major variable in our renewal model. Candidates are immersed in an intensive graduate program, which compresses the traditional three years of professional training into a fifteen-month full-time internship. This professional educator program learned significant lessons that should be shared with other teacher educators. In addition to professional competence, job stress, student conflict, and family as well as

pressures that must be mastered by these interns; they must also learn and demonstrate proficiency on the four Praxis III Domains and associated 19 criteria (ETS, 1995). These 19 Criteria are demonstrated through an electronic portfolio. The use of PRAXIS III/Pathwise in the training and orientation of both Professional Educator Program (PEP) interns and professional clinical faculty mentoring these students is but one of our renewal efforts. The State of Ohio passed legislation (1998) supporting PRAXIS as the performance based system to license future educators. In anticipation of this important shift from certification to licensure, Wright State University (WSU) developed a format for the electronic portfolio using PRAXIS as the template (see Chart 1).

Historical Overview of Wright State's Redesign Efforts

Partners Transforming Education: School•University•Community (CEHS, 1995) is a process model to plan and articulate the simultaneous renewal of the education of educators and faculty in the PreK-12 sector. The College of Education and Human Services', Wright State University, formal involvement in this ongoing process to bring about systemic change to Pre-K higher education began in January 1992. *Partners Transforming Education* (1995) involved over 430 people representative of the Prek-12 sector, business, human service agencies, the University and assorted others, to provide input on the changes needed to create a new culture of collaboration that is responsive to society's needs.

Individuals from the PreK-12 sector, working with this initiative, are classroom teachers and administrators representative of a number of school systems within the Dayton metropolitan region that Wright State University serves. With the amount of criticism aimed at the public schools and the growing concern about teacher education programs (Fernandez, 1993, Spanbauer, 1996), educators can no longer work in isolation. The College faced the challenge and invited not only the PreK-12 sector to join in problem solving, but turned to the university at large and the community to work collaboratively in building a program that prepares qualified pre-service teachers and provides renewal of PreK-12 and higher education faculties and administrators simultaneously.

This "simultaneous renewal" concept of both PreK-12 and Teacher Education surfaced as an essential component of advancement efforts. No partnership can exist where only one partner grows and benefits. As Goodlad establishes in *Educational Renewal: Better Teachers, Better Schools* (1994) working together must be mutually advantageous. Also, the critical need to provide insights on how school-university partnerships work overrides the fundamental process of organizational change. The altering of existing practices are paramount to documenting change in relationships between schools and partner Colleges of Education (Patterson, Michelli and Pacheco, 1999). Day-to-day operations in renewal partnerships demand the documentation of discussions and changes in practices that provide empirical evidence about change.

Partners Transforming Education is moving forward with redesigned teacher education curricula, a conceptualized post-baccalaureate professional

school model, and formally established partnership sites within PreK-12 schools. Classroom teachers, school administrators, arts and sciences faculty, education and human services faculty, and community representatives are continuing to serve as integral collaborators in the ongoing process for renewal. All partners are actively involved in professional development activities and a re-designed governance structure. The partner schools and districts also identified agendas of specific goals and improvements. The partnership goal focuses on moving the agenda of both parties forward. Funding from the DeWitt-Wallace Foundation (1998) has provided resources to assist all partners in simultaneous renewal.

The University/School District Partnership Agreement

As suggested by the NNER, WSU has developed written *Partnership Agreements* with four school systems requesting partnerships (see Chart 2). The *Agreement* serves as a working document to articulate the purposes and direction of the collaboration. The four partnership purposes established by the NNER and supported by WSU Partnerships are:

- Creating and sustaining learning communities which enables PreK-12 learners and partners to construct meaningful knowledge:
- Preparing Educators;
- Providing Professional Development; and
- Conducting Inquiry *(NNER Compact For Partnership Schools,* 1994).

After sustained discussion, a final working document is agreed upon by both the public school and higher education administration. The document

includes a mission statement and Partnership Goals, Partnership Principles, Partnership Outcomes, Partnership Supporting Actions, Partner Commitment and Governance Principles. An Intern Policy Statement is attached to the document to assure clear understanding of joint expectations of the university students.

The Professional Educator Program

WSU is a state-supported university dedicated to the educational, social, and cultural needs of the Dayton area with an enrollment of 17,000 graduate and undergraduate students. WSU developed the Professional Educator Program (PEP) as part of college efforts to be a collaborative partner in teacher preparation and professional development of K-12 practitioners.

The PEP uses the medical school model that permits a select group of post-baccalaureate students to practice the art and science of teaching in a clinical environment. The strength of the program is that the interns experience the total ecology of the school beginning the summer prior to and concluding the summer following the school year. The interns earn their teaching certificate (license) after 15 months of intensive field-based preparation. They build on their undergraduate degree to become a certified/licensed Ohio teacher.

The PEP cohort consists of student interns who are housed in public schools. The cohort includes persons who had prior professional experience in the military, business, and other careers. Teachers who voluntarily complete a six-hour training session serve as clinical faculty members in partnership with teacher education faculty. The clinical faculty provide a learning laboratory that is rich in

problem solving, collaborative teaching and learning opportunities. These clinical faculty mentors supervise the interns in cohort groups and demonstrate teaching and learning approaches. As a result, public school students in primary through 12th grade gain from the fluid and cooperative interaction of professional educator interns, clinical faculty and College of Education personnel.

Evaluating Partnerships

The purpose of this paper is to present a process model for evaluation of school-university partnerships and the following objectives frame the content of this paper:

1. To present the university's inter-collegial collaboration model for teacher content preparation model.
2. To explain a process for documentation of content and teaching proficiency via an electronic portfolio.
3. To present the evaluation process used in a multi-faceted renewal project.

The evaluation model developed is one step in documenting educational improvements and in providing the public evidence that schools are improving. The evaluation analysis used to assess this educational program drew from observational data, archival materials and survey results.

The philosophy of collaboration/renewal in partner schools is based on a belief that this effort is an integrated process and requires continuous study over time. As used in this study, the evaluation process required a model utilizing a number of approaches to secure data from selected teachers, students, administrators and university participants. For the purposes of this paper,

evaluation is defined as "the process of clarifying a set of informational needs, and collecting, analyzing, and reporting the information to interested parties" (Wolf, 1979, p. 20). The evaluation addressed the following research questions:

1. What impact have renewal efforts had on the practice of professional teachers, administrators and interns in the partner schools?

2. What renewal values have accrued to participating partner schools and the university in relation to professional growth, performance assessment of first year teachers, and revising professional development programs for teachers?

3. What factors are impeding acceptance of a renewal philosophy in partner schools?

After review of the evaluation questions, a design document was prepared that set forth detailed evaluation methods (see Table 1).

Insert Table 1 Here

The conceptual framework for assessing the impact of educational renewal and its effect on all participants represents an attempt to measure causal factors, which determine how individuals related to the goals of this project. Specifically, we were looking for determinants of implementation. These determinants included the school district's experience with renewal, adoption strategies, organizational capacity for change and factors that operate to facilitate or impede the implementation of the renewal philosophy. The quality of implementation interacts with the opportunity to infuse the 19 Goodlad Postulates (Goodlad, 1994) in the *conversation* about renewal.

The complex nature of this evaluation reflected the program's multi-dimensions and was driven in turn by the variety of instruments used. Data collection involved the use of multiple information sources:

1. Unobtrusive observation of participants by a trained observer at advisory group meetings.

1. Content analysis of archival material, e.g. minutes, logs and other records.

1. Focus group interviews of selected teachers, school administrators, university faculty and interns.

4. Survey questionnaire results from intact groups of teachers, administrators and interns.

Findings/Results

As an impact assessment of an active renewal initiative involving an ongoing program and whether it is having met effects in the desired direction, it was necessary to utilize both quantitative and qualitative data. The relative advantages and disadvantages of the two types of data have been debated in some detail in the social science literature (Cook and Reichard, 1979, and Lincoln and Guba, 1985). We choose to include both quantitative and qualitative data for a fuller assessment of an ongoing program. The goal of this impact assessment was to arrive at a valid inference about whether an ongoing program was having impact in the desired direction (Wolf, 1979). In short, would our findings have generalizability to the program as it actually operated, or to similar programs in comparable settings? Findings are reported in the following sections:

Part A – Analysis of Archival Materials:

For the past 3 years the Department of Teacher Education (TED), CEHS has been operating a network of Professional Development Schools in the Dayton Metropolitan Region (AKA "Partner Schools"). The school districts are Dayton Public Schools (urban), Fairborn City Schools (Suburban), and Trotwood-Madison (rural). All PDS's and TED have been working to develop simultaneous renewal of school-based learning, Teacher Education, and the continued development of in-service teachers. The Professional development School model is designed to work collaboratively with schools in four main areas: pre-service teacher preparation, staff development, inquiry research and simultaneous renewal through use of the National Network for Educational Renewal (NNER) 19 Postulates (Goodlad, 1994).

During the 1998-99 school year renewal participants were to focus on:

- Strengthening, developing and expanding partnerships with Dayton Public Schools, as well as other Dayton Metropolitan Area Public schools (DMAPS).
- Further elaboration and development in all stakeholders a shared understanding of the agenda of NNER and WSU's Partners Transforming Education initiative.

A number of relevant activities were developed to lead this renewal agenda. For example:

- Partnership expansion – PDS sites at Trotwood High School, Shilohview Elementary and Dunbar High School were finalized and advisory councils established in 1998-99.
- Development of a middle school PDS was explored with Dayton Public School administrators and Fairview Middle School was selected and the faculty voted to participate in Spring, 1999.

- Professional initiatives to secure additional funding support for advancing the agenda of simultaneous renewal were secured through a collaborative arrangement with Project SUSTAIN and the Dean's Discretionary Fund Account in CEHS (state funds).

- Sustained conversations with the College of Liberal Arts (COLA) and the College of Science and Mathematics (COSM) have led to joint appointments with the Departments of Mathematics, Geology, Physics and Biology. These faculty have participated in the Local Associates Institute for discussion of collaboration in the renewal of PDS's and Teacher Education.

- A Local Associates Institute (LAI) was planned, coordinated and delivered in 1999:
    - LAI 1 was held on January 22-23, 1999,
    - LAI 2 was held on April 16-17, 1999,
    - LAI 3 was planned for July 9-10, 1999.

  Analysis of Institute agenda notes and oral discussions indicate sustained attention to the 19 Postulates and "urban education".

- Strong and sustained attention was a hallmark of this year's Dewitt-Wallace project to the recruitment of underrepresented students and /or teachers to participate in renewal activities through the partnerships. University Fellowships were awarded to 15 degree candidates through the Professional Educators Program (PEP) for study commencing in Summer, 1999.

In summary, the expected outcomes as stated in the original Dewitt-Wallace proposal indicate significant accomplishment of all 8 outcomes (see Table 2).

Analysis of information contained in archival materials (minutes, logs and other records) was conducted to provide insight into the "process of renewal" as manifested in the PDS and university sites. Conceptualizing and measuring the implementation was considered important for several reasons (Rossi and Freeman, 1993). First, we reasoned that unless the process of renewal, as defined by practitioners, was carefully examined, we might have ended up evaluating a bias of unknown magnitude (Kalton, 1983). Secondly, a literature review provided significant guidance for analyzing renewal theory and practice through use of ethnographic research tools to secure a "mutual adaptation" perspective

from all parties involved. This approach recognizes the evolving character of renewal in schools and universities and the diversity of approaches. A number of forces operate to facilitate or impede the introduction of renewal concepts (19 Postulates) into either school systems or teacher education. Refining the intent and meaning of "renewal" was in itself a daunting task.

Insert Table 2 Here

From our analysis of archival material: minutes, notes, logs and other records, it appeared that renewal manifested itself along essentially five dimensions:

- Changes in tangible resources – facilities, staff, equipment, materials.
- Changes in intangible resources – staffing assignments, organizational alignments, intern groupings.
- Changes in knowledge and understanding on the part of all participants – clinical faculty, school administrators, university faculty, university administrators and PEP Interns.
- Changes in role/behavior of participants.
- Value internalization – commitment and attitudes toward renewal.

The scope of this evaluation was focused on value internalization and documented changes in knowledge/understanding of NNER renewal postulates as cited through content analysis of notes, minutes, logs and other records. In addition, assessment for the participants was provided through structured focus group sessions conducted by evaluation staff and analysis of survey data. The results from content analysis of printed material follow. Findings from the Focus Groups will be found in Part B and survey results in Part C.

To facilitate data presentation, the analysis of minutes, logs and other records is presented in alignment with the specific advisory group and includes a final summary statement. The log analysis for the PDS/CEHS Steering Committee is presented as one example of data collection from a total of seven functioning advisory groups.

Wright State University – Dayton Public Schools Steering Committee

The Partnership Agreement between DPS and CEHS was formally signed on April 1, 1999 between the two parties. The DPS agreed to participate on a steering committee to oversee policy, establish a process for operation, plan collaboratively and work as a team for conflict resolution. The comments are organized around factors, which operated to facilitate or impede implementation of the NNER renewal philosophy (see Table 3) as recorded in notes, logs and records. The information was reviewed for trends, categories, etc.

Table 3 presents the major categories cited in minutes, notes and records of the WSU/DPS Steering Committee. As can be seen from Table 3, the most common topic focused on organizational concerns, e.g. intern placements, training for reserve teachers, stipends for workshops and scheduling of interns. Discussion of the 19 Postulates and the simultaneous renewal process was also a topic of consistent discussion. Please note, most meetings were scheduled for 1 1/2 hours, but side bar discussions often proved detracting to extended analysis of the topics.

Insert Table 3 Here

Part B – Focus Group Responses:

A focus group is defined as a carefully planned discussion designed to obtain perceptions or insights on a specific area of interest in a non-threatening environment. It is conducted with seven to ten people by a skilled interviewer. Our "specific area of interest" was the perceptions that interns, clinical faculty, university faculty and partner school principals held about the school/university partnership. Focus group discussions were planned to be relaxed, comfortable, and enjoyable for all participants as ideas and comments were shared.

Focus group discussions were two hours in length and were convened on March 24 and May 26, 1999. A population of 70 interns, clinical and university faculty, and partner school administrators were invited to participate. Thirty respondents were involved in four separate focus groups, led by two university professors experienced in conducting focus group discussions, who served as facilitators and recorders. To begin each focus group, facilitators outlined the purpose of the focus groups and the process that would be employed for the discussion.

In general, the purpose of the focus group aspect of this assessment was to gather participant perceptions of the efficacy of the school/university partnership. More specifically, three primary elements reflecting the research questions cited in the Funding Request Application to the Institute for Educational Renewal, comprised the focus of group discussions:

- Participant understanding and awareness of the concept of educational renewal (as addressed in Goodlad, 1994).

- Participant perception of the impact that renewal efforts have had on professional practice, and

- Participant perception of those factors mitigating against or impeding educational renewal in the partner schools.

The following questions were used to focus discussion with each of the four groups:

1. When you think of the concept of educational renewal... What does it mean to you? How would you define or describe educational renewal?

2. From your perspective, how do you see the Dewitt-Wallace school/university partnership accomplishing educational renewal as it has been defined/described?

3. What factors might be impeding the understanding and acceptance of educational renewal (or the acceptance of a renewal philosophy) in the partner schools?

4. From your perspective, what impact have renewal efforts (associated with the Dewitt-Wallace school/university partnership) had on the professional practice (i.e., both process and outcomes) of interns, clinical faculty, university faculty, and school administrators?

5. If you were to design a school-university partnership (such as the Dewitt-Wallace school/university partnership) that would succeed in achieving educational renewal, what would it look like?... be comprised of?

For purposes of brevity only responses to questions 1 are presented.

<u>The Concept of Educational Renewal (question #1)</u>

Intern Perspectives:

Interns articulated a conception of educational renewal as personal, and directly related to meaningful opportunities for professional improvement.

Renewal is "…being able to apply what I know and what I'm learning." "It happens when I enter the classroom with new ideas and strategies." "(Renewal) is learning about how people learn." Most interns agreed that the renewal "opportunity" they are experiencing "…is the reciprocal relationship between clinical faculty and interns. We learn from them, they learn from us." A less dominant intern perception suggested that renewal involves an "immersion" into some aspect of education or classroom life such as educational technology or the Ohio Model Curriculums.

Clinical Faculty Perspectives:

Clinical faculty spoke of their understanding of educational renewal as being "a term bantered around school" to that which "Reminds me why I went into this job originally." Most concurred that renewal "is renewal of ourselves, new learning for us" or "a chance to step back, individually and collectively, to reflect on what we are doing" and is "an excitement about what we're doing and about the *new stuff*." Like the interns, clinical faculty saw educational renewal as personal, yet they articulated a group or school level aspect as well. They reported attending meetings and asking, "What is it that we want to renew in ourselves or school?" Several teachers mentioned that this tends to take a programmatic turn when concerns such as parent involvement, discipline, homework, or cooperation/collaboration amongst faculty and staff emerge.

School Administrator Perspectives:

Administrators described educational renewal as "staying current with research" and "doing things differently to improve the teaching-learning process." They cited scheduling school-to-work opportunities, grading, student assessment, looping, classroom management, staff/professional development, and the use of educational technology as examples of targets for renewal. One principal stated that "Renewal is an attitude or a mindset that serves as your infrastructure for life-long learning. Renewal is not achieved through directives or compliance mandates. Schools must have the authority (and funds) to carry out renewal. Restrictive policies, procedures, and standards are barriers to 'best practice'." Others concurred and confirmed their belief that "We spend too much time looking outside the classroom. We need to look more deeply inside at teaching and learning processes. This is renewal."

University Faculty Perspectives:

While one university faculty member described renewal as "continual self improvement – increasing one's assets via a reflective process" most agreed that it is "...bigger than the individual. It is systemic and simultaneous in nature." In general, this faculty described renewal by contrasting it with reform. More specifically, they stated that reform described renewal by contrasting it with reform. More specifically, they stated that reform denotes a "broke and needs fixing," outside-in and top-down, exclusive approach to improving education. On the other hand, renewal, they suggested, is "more positive," is focused on

continual improvement, and is designed to "bring our desires and realities closer together" while including "the voices of diversity".

Part C: Perception of the Partnership

A questionnaire was sent to all public school administrators, university faculty, clinical faculty and interns participating in the partnership. Sixty-eight questionnaires were returned for a response rate of 69%. Of these, 21 were interns, 27 were clinical faculty, 11 were university faculty, and 9 were public school administrators.

On twenty-one of the items a majority of the respondents answered with a "great extent" or a "very great extent". Of these items, those that received at least 70% "great extent" and "very great extent", combined responses were in order for the following items:

Item	% Great Extent & Very Great Extent
14. Do you believe interns in your school – university partnership have opportunities to move beyond traditional organized knowledge to become teachers who inquire into both knowledge and its teaching?	82.81%
11. Are those involved in the school-university partnership committed to the moral, ethical, and enculturating responsibilities of teaching?	81.82%
15. Is the demonstration of excellence in teaching (i.e., quality content, wide range of instructional materials, physical environment, student-teacher relationships, etc.) a priority among the responsible faculty?	77.27%
18. Are the relationships between faculty and interns throughout the length and breadth of the program to be commended?	75.38%

25. Do partner schools provide the array of resources and experiences necessary for a quality internship?	75.00%
12. Are the moral, ethical, and enculturating responsibilities of teaching communicated to interns?	73.85%
10. Are responsible faculty members and interns engaged in scholarly work focused on a better understanding of the aims of education?	70.77%

These were the items the respondents perceived as being best accomplished by the partnership schools in this external evaluation.

There were six items that did not receive a majority of "great extent" or "very great extent" combined responses. These would be the items respondents perceived as least accomplished by the partnership. Of these six items the respondents were split with 50% responding "little extent" and "some extent" and 50% responding "great extent" and "very great extent" on items 8 (are open exchanges of views and collaboration characteristics of the actions of all responsible faculty?) and 17 (are interns encouraged to evaluate what is being done to them and happening to them?). On the other four items a majority of the respondents answered either "little extent" or "some extent". These items were in order:

Item	**% Little Extent and Some Extent**
7. Are there procedures in place for evaluating the school university partnership?	71.21%
4. Have renewal efforts (associated with your school-university partnership) affected professional practice of school administrators?	69.23%

23. Do responsible faculty members in the school-university partnership address the theory and research on "change" with interns? 60.94%

26. Has renewal efforts, from your perspective, addressed the dilemma of the practical versus theoretical aspects of education? 51.56%

To determine whether there were statistically significant differences in perceptions of the four groups, a chi square statistic was computed for each of the 26 items. Due to small frequencies in some cells, the "little extent" and "some extent" categories were combined as were the "great extent" and "very great extent" categories. This resulted in 2x4 contingency tables for each item with the .05 level established for significance. While it was hypothesized that the groups would have different perceptions in the items, statistically significant differences were found for only five items (7, 8, 18, 11 and 25). A discussion of these differences follows:

7. **Are there procedures in place for evaluating the school-university partnership?**

   (Chi square = 8.04, $p < .05$) Public school administrators gave a majority of "great extent" and "very great extent" references. The other three groups gave a majority of "least extent" and "some extent".

8. **Are open exchanges of views and collaboration characteristic of the actions of all responsible faculty?**

   (Chi square = 8.42, $p < .05$) Interns and university faculty gave a majority of "little extent" and "some extent" responses, whereas clinical faculty and public school administrators gave a majority of "great extent" and "very great extent".

18. Are the relationships between the faculty and interns throughout the length and breadth of the program to be commended?

(Chi square = 9.52, $p < .05$) Interns were split 50/50 while the other three groups gave a majority of "great extent" and "very great extent"

22. Do interns and faculty talk about quality versus quantity in education?

(Chi square = 9.69, $p < .05$) Clinical faculty gave a majority of "great extent" and "very great extent" whereas the other three groups gave a majority of "little extent" and "some extent".

25. Do partner schools provide the array of resources and experiences necessary for a quality internship?

(Chi square = 12.98, $p < .05$) University faculty gave a majority of "little extent" and "some extent" where as the other three groups gave a majority of "great extent" and "very great extent". The main factor in the Chi square being so highly significant is that all but two of the clinical faculty gave "great extent" and "very great extent" responses.

Conclusion

From our analysis of archival materials, minutes, notes, logs and other records, it appeared that renewal manifested itself along essentially five dimensions:

- Changes in tangible resources – facilities, staff, equipment and materials.
- Changes in intangible resources – Staffing assignments, organizational assignments, and intern groupings.
- Changes in knowledge and understanding on the part of all participants – clinical faculty, school administrators, university faculty, university administrators, and PEP interns as assessed by oral coding of discussions.
- Changes in role/behavior of participants to implement renewal changes.
- Value internalization – commitment and attitudes toward renewal as documented in discussions, minutes, notes, etc.

A second portion of this evaluation process centered on value internalization and documented changes in knowledge/understanding of NNER renewal postulates as cited through content analysis of notes, minutes, logs and other records. In summary, results from content analysis indicate:

- Organizational concerns were primary discussion topics.
- Teacher failure to understand renewal was cited.
- NCATE requirements and audit drove planning.
- Faculty role, e.g. experienced teachers felt more comfortable with role as mentors.

A total of nine functioning advisory groups were involved in governance issues for this effort.

Insert Table 2 Here

Since there were only these five items where the perceptions differed significantly, it can be concluded that the perceptions of the respondents were reasonably consistent. These five, however, might warrant some discussion among the four groups. The public school people (administrators and clinical faculty) tended to be more positive in their perceptions than the university people (faculty and interns).

Discussion and Implications

It seems obvious from analysis of archival material, focus groups and survey data, that several conclusions can be drawn from the data:

- Consistent conversations with either direct or indirect relation to the 19 Postulates occurred in advisory council meetings.
- Consistent conversations occurred with a focus on policy and/or procedural matters relevant to each PDS site and appeared to dominate the conversation.
- Consistent conversations occurred with a focus on matters of concern to PDS school administrators and faculty.
- Consistent support by school administrators, clinical faculty, university faculty and interns was noted in the areas of inquiry based knowledge; commitment to moral, ethical, and enculturating responsibilities of teaching; excellence in teaching; colleague relationships; and scholarly inquiry for better understanding of the aims of education.
- Consistent citation by school administrators, clinical faculty, university faculty and interns identified items "least" accomplished by the partnership. The areas were evaluating the partnership; impact of renewal on professional practice of school administrators; sharing the "change" with interns; and addressing the practical versus theoretical aspects of education.

The multi-level involvement of teachers, school administrators and university faculty assisted in bringing renewal to a level of common understanding. For example, hierarchical conventions were amended as both clinical faculty and university faculty teamed to discuss, explore and solve problems for the education of educators in simultaneous renewal sessions. However, a tendency to micro-manage by several participants tended to stall the renewal agenda, e.g., statements to the effect that the "NNER Model – was not the only agenda for school renewal," and "requiring the faculty P.I.'s to clear expenditures and agenda items

through the administration" was not conducive to providing leadership for the renewal agenda as defined in this project.

The following recommendations were from data generated in this study report and are suggested to professionals evaluating renewal efforts:

Recommendation 1: Analyze the data across groups to generate a cohesive renewal strategy – identify common concerns of all participants.

Recommendation 2: Analyze for continuous improvement – look for samples of "best practice as related to simultaneous renewal".

Recommendation 3: Analyze the number of advisory councils and define "management" to the key stakeholders. Reduce "fire-fighting" agenda/discussions and encourage purposeful action.

Recommendation 4: Analyze how the vision of "new simultaneous renewal" for all Partners was enculturated in each partner school.

Recommendation 5: Analyze the leadership charge and identify transformation characteristics and use of macro-management strategies to implement the Postulates in simultaneous renewal.

Recommendation 6: Analyze the administrative structure for all renewal activities, e.g. Partnerships, PEP, funded projects to ensure clear articulation of administrative role and function.

Recommendation 7: Analyze the recruitment and operational materials (policy and procedures) for all advisory councils, interns, etc.

Summary

By careful analysis of the information, we have gleaned a strong sense of support for the renewal of teacher education and strengthening of partnerships with the participating public schools in these specific settings. While there are minor concerns regarding administrative structure and governance, there continues to be strong support for related renewal activities such as the PEP program and the use of advisory councils with the partner schools. The evaluation

evidence was conclusive as sustained conversation regarding the agenda of simultaneous renewal did occur under the auspices of this funded project. The evaluators believe that the model developed and used to assess this renewal effort has transportability to other sites seeking to evaluate multi-institution collaboratives.

As with any educational experience, reflections must illustrate both positive and negative lessons learned. The prior work of Goodlad (1984, 1990, 1994) and his leadership team provided a process for assessing renewal activities at partner sites and developing the critical questions to seek answers for.

One of the richest ideas articulated by the Goodlad and senior associates' philosophy was the need to establish governance or advisory councils. Advisory councils proved imperative. The nine advisory councils, representing all the key players (interns, teachers, principals and WSU faculty) in the program made decisions about the day to day operation of the PEP and building renewal efforts. Major decisions coming out of these councils included: an attendance policy and procedures for professional days, absenteeism and personal days, substitute procedures, and renewal trip arrangements. Another idea adopted from Goodlad, et. al., supported having the Partner Schools collaborate on renewal. The Advisory Council identified a yearlong renewal effort, which they desired to explore.

Of the many positive lessons learned, the following are illustrative examples:

- *Interns highly valued all field internship work;*
- *Teachers validated that interns made major differences in PreK-6 students' lives;*
- *Teachers were motivated to undertake extensive renewal activities;*
- *Teachers verified that they were more focused on personal excellence when entrusted with apprenticing a future educator;*
- *University faculty experienced the real world of day to day teaching;*
- *Intern problems were addressed quickly through concern conferences (five in fall term 1999 alone); and*
- *Interns bonded with each other as a support group.*

The list of the liabilities was approached in a positive manner. It highlights those elements, which must be addressed. These include:

- *Interns must identify financial resources and personal support systems for the 15-month period.*
- *Interns and clinical faculty due process for disagreements/concerns must be clarified.*
- *Teachers desire input into university curriculum and practice.*
- *Better avenues for communication must be established.*
- *More university attention is needed at the school site.*
- *Flexibility and civility must be stressed in summer coursework: i.e. classroom placement, syllabi or participants.*

Summary

Evidence indicates that this "Renewal effort" and "Professional Educator Program" proved dynamic and enriching for beginning practitioners. These interns have been exposed to and participated in a 15-month field based teacher education program. They are ready; their PRAXIS-based electronic portfolios demonstrate teaching proficiency in the four crucial domains and visually display their commitment and ability to teach and make a difference in students' lives. The public can ask if these interns are more competent teachers, and we can answer with confidence that these educators are most certainly better prepared and their electronic portfolios serve as authentic assessments of the effectiveness of the PEP model for teacher preparation.

Note: Funding for the evaluation of this renewal project was received from the Dewitt-Wallace – Reader Digest Fund Incentive Award for Teacher Education, 1998-99, College of Education and Human Services, Wright State University, Dayton, Ohio.

References

DeWitt-Wallace Foundation (1998). Development of renewal Partnerships. Seattle, WA: Institute for Educational Renewal. Author.

Clark, R. (1997). Professional development schools: Policy and planning. Washington, D.C.: AACTE.

Cook, T.D., and Reichrd, C.S. (Ed.S.) (1979). Qualitative and quantitative methods in evaluation research. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Fernandez, J.A. (1993). Tales out of School. Boston, MA: Little, Brown and Company.

Goodlad, J. (1994), Educational renewal: Better teachers, better schools. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Goodlad, J. (1990), Teachers for our nation's schools. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Goodlad, J. (1984), A place called school: Prospects for the future. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.

Kalton, G. (1983). Introduction to survey sampling. Newbury Park, CA: Sage

Lincoln, Y.S., and Guba, E.G. (1985). Naturalistic inquiry. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

NNER Compact for Partnership Schools (1994), Dayton, OH, College of Education and Human Services. Author.

Partners Transforming Evaluation (1995). Dayton, OH: College of Education and Human Services, Wright State University. Author.

Patterson, R.S., Michelli, N.M. and Pacheco, A. (1999). Centers of pedagogy: New structures for educational renewal. SanFrancisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Rossi, P.H., and Freeman, H.E. (1993). Evaluation: A systematic approach. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Spanbauer, S. (1996). Reengineering education with quality. Indianapolis, IN: USA Group Research Institute.

The PRAXIS Series (1995). Princeton, NJ: Educational Testing Service.

Wolf, R. (1979). Evaluation of education. New York, NY: Prager Publishers.

Chart 1

Model Portfolio Format for PRAXIS

Section Title	Sample Information Needed	Sample Items Included
Introduction (Domain A, D)	Background information.	Resume
	Professional experience.	Philosophy Statement
	Present teaching situation.	Description of School or Classroom
Environment (Domain B)	Creation of rich classroom setting. Materials selected – teacher made or published.	Photographs of bulletin boards. Diagram of room arrangement. Bibliographies of selected materials.
Instruction (Domain C)	Planning and implementation of lessons. Integration of content.	Lesson plans. Audio or videos of actual lessons. Handouts or overheads used in lessons. Thematic teaching units.
Individualization (Domain A)	Assessment of students' needs. Adaptations of lessons to meet need.	Student work samples. Evaluation of lessons and instruments. Feedback received from others. Case studies.
Integration (Domain D)	Statement of personal beliefs about teaching. Goals for improvement of teaching.	Philosophy of Education. Copies of Evaluations by others. Awards or honors.

Chart 2

Partnership Contract Guidelines

- Mission Statement - Focus on renewal of both institutions.
- Partnership Goals - General goals to set tone and direction.
- Partnership Principals - Fundamental educational beliefs to improve education.
- Partnership Core Functions – Basic purpose to which the organization's resources
- are committed.
- Partnership Outcomes – Impact of renewal on student learning in the classroom.
- Partnership Commitment – To work as a renewal team for the improvement of school and teacher education.

NOTE: These guidelines are used in developing a formal agreement for School Board and University Trustees to review and approve.

Table 1

Design Procedures

Research Questions	Partner Activities	Evaluation/Design Methods	Outcomes/Technical Evaluation Report
1. What impact have renewal efforts had on the professional practice of teachers, educators, administrators and interns in the partner schools?	❖ Advisory group meetings	Participant/Unobtrusive Observation by trained evaluator (Qualitative)	- Part A: Analysis of project minutes, records, etc.
2. What renewal values have accrued to participating partner schools and the university in relation to professional growth, performance assessment of first year teachers and revising pre-professional development programs?	❖ Orientation to NNER Philosophy Sessions ❖ Number of Advisory Groups: N=7	Analysis of Archival Materials (Qualitative)	- Part B: Focus group findings.
3. What factors are impeding acceptance of the renewal philosophy in partner schools?	❖ Number of Participants: Teachers N=33 Interns N=33 Administrators N=9 University Faculty N=11	Survey Questionnaires to Clinical teachers, School Administrators, University Faculty and Interns (Quantitative)	- Part C: Analysis of survey responses.

Note: The evaluation design uses both quantitative and qualitative procedures, but relies heavily on judgmental assessments for drawing conclusions.

Table 2

Project Outcomes for 1998 – 99

Outcome	Evaluation Evidence
• Expanded Partnership. (Postulate 15)	A total of 3 new settings were added in 1988 – 99.
• Urban Middle School (Postulate 15)	Fairview Middle School, DPS added in Spring, 1999.
• Professional Experiences for PEP Interns aligned with new state licensure. (Postulate 10)	Electronic Portfolio model developed to align with PRAXIS II Domains and learned society guidelines
• Empirical data established. (Postulate 17)	Minutes, notes, logs and test results on PRAXIS II, Professional Assessments For Beginning teachers (ETS, 1994).
• Expanded core of academic and clinical faculty in place. (Postulate 4)	All sites established clinical faculty positions sand dual appointments between COLA, COSM and CEHS finalized.
• Diversity in student pool and clinical faculty increased.	Verified through student admits to PEP (N=33) and CF appointments N=33.
• Expanded pool of participants from PDS sites and on WSU campus.	Expansion of sites provided about 12 CF, Interns were 33 and dual appointments totaled 7. Also, selected faculty and administrators from COLA and COSM participated in DMANER LAI.
• Dual appointment faculty at Wright State.	Increase noted through participation in LAI and official dual appointments, N=7.

Table 3
WSU-DPS Steering Committee Topics on Postulates,
Renewal and Organizational Concerns

Identification of Topics	Number of Citations
• Simultaneous renewal and unpacking the postulates.	3
• Review PEP admissions process.	1
• Define DPS/Partner School.	1
• Teachers must understand renewal process/conversation.	5
• Staff needs to know partnership theory.	1
• What should a partner school look like?	2
• What is Induction? Mentoring?	2
• How do children learn?	1
• How does renewal relate to NNER?	1
• How do we involve parents?	2
• Organizational concerns; e.g. Intern placement, reserve teachers, stipends.	13
• Placement of Interns.	1
• Need for content courses in discipline.	1
• Faculty role, e.g. experienced teachers feel more comfortable with their role.	3
• NCATE Requirements and Audit.	4
• PDS Faculty "leery" of inquiry research.	1
• How to avoid burnout of Clinical Faculty.	1
• PRAXIS Training for PDS.	2